

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,841		09/05/2003	David K. Platner	60,130-1721/03MRA0169	8384
26096	7590	09/08/2004		EXAMINER	
	•	KEY & OLDS, P.C	TORRES, MELANIE		
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD SUITE 350				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BIRMING	HAM, M	1I 48009	3683		
				DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Commence	10/656,841	PLATNER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melanie Torres	3683
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Se</u>	eptember 2003.	
	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E		
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecd drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/5/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/656,841 Page 2

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duchemin in view of McGibbon et al.

Re claims 1-6, Duchemin discloses a leaf spring (1) comprising: a forward leaf spring segment (right side) comprising an arcuate member (4) extending therefrom; a rearward leaf spring segment (left side) of a lesser depth and a greater width than said forward leaf spring segment; and a mounting segment (2) intermediate said forward leaf spring segment and said rearward leaf spring segment. As can be seen in figures, at least a portion of the forward leaf spring segment is of greater depth and lesser width than the rearward portion. (Figures 1-7) However, Duchemin does not teach wherein the leaf spring is a composite. McGibbon et al. teaches a composite leaf spring. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a composite material in the spring of Duchemin since it is well known in the art that composites are lightweight.

Application/Control Number: 10/656,841

Art Unit: 3683

3. Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duchemin in view of McGibbon et al.

Re claims 7-15, Duchemin teaches a suspension comprising a leaf spring (1) comprising a forward leaf spring segment (right side) defining an arcuate segment (4), a rearward leaf spring segment (left side) and a mounting segment (2) intermediate said forward leaf spring segment and said rearward leaf spring segment. (Figures 1-7) However, Duchemin does not teach wherein the leaf spring is a composite. McGibbon et al. teaches a composite leaf spring. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a composite material in the spring of Duchemin since it is well known in the art that composites are lightweight. Further, Duchemin does not teach a rear attachment system comprising a shear damper mounted to the rearward spring segment. McGibbon et al. teach a rear attachment system comprising a shear damper (24) mounted to the rearward spring segment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the shear damper of McGibbon et al. in the system of Duchemin since it is well known that shear dampers are used in suspension systems to reduce the shear stresses on leaf spring suspensions.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/656,841

Art Unit: 3683

Ohno et al., Snyder, and Koumbis teach composite leaf springs. Davis et al., Heitzmann, and Gentry et al., teach shear dampers.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Torres whose telephone number is (703)305-0293. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on (703)308-3421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MT

September 6, 2004

Helaxie Gerres